

LAOS

THE WASHINGTON POST

DATE

JUN 11

# Senate Told Nixon Aid to Laos Illegal

By Spencer Rich  
Washington Post Staff Writer

Behind barred doors, Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) told a rare, 3-hour-and-22-minute secret session of the Senate yesterday that President Nixon has violated a congressional ban against U.S. financing of foreign mercenary troops fighting for the government of Laos.

Symington, who said he wants the Senate to know all the details of "the secret war" in Laos before voting any more funds for it, was quoted by senators present as saying that the administration wants \$374 million next year for Laotian economic and military assistance. This includes \$120 million for financing a covert CIA military operation in northern Laos that arms some 32,000 Meo and other tribesmen and now is using some 4,800 troops recruited in Thailand.

Symington, Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.) and J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), among others who have urged the administration to make public the details of this nation's Laotian involvement, stressed that the figures cited in the closed Senate session were exclusive of the cost of B-52 and other air raids in Laos conducted by U.S. planes flying from Thailand, South Vietnam, other bases and carriers.

Fulbright said after the session that his staff calculates the cost of bombs alone for such raids at \$500 million a year. Other Senate sources said this figure was probably low, and said the total cost of bombing and air activity conducted by the U.S. over Laos might actually be up to \$2 billion a year. Their reasoning:

Testimony before Symington's Subcommittee on U.S. Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad disclosed that the bomb load of planes smaller than the B-52 cost an average of \$3,190 per sortie.

With 10,000 or more sorties a month being flown over Laos, north and south, and with larger-load B-52s now in use, the bomb and flight cost is between \$1 billion and \$2 billion a year.

One senator who was present said Symington, after charging that the administration was violating a 1970 congressional ban on the hiring of mercenaries to fight for the government of Laos, angrily asserted that "he wouldn't be in the Senate if it wrote laws that anyone could flout, including the President."

"Case was very effective also; he made an emotional plea to bring this thing out in the open, find ways to end the war not enlarge it."

Symington told reporters later that he plans to introduce an amendment to the defense procurement authorization bill, when it reaches the Senate floor, holding economic, military and CIA aid to Laos to \$200 million. He said the amendment, however, would not bar added expenditures for bombing the Ho Chi Minh trail in Southern Laos to interdict the flow of North Vietnamese men and supplies to South Vietnam.

A key issue in the debate and in a later long-range exchange between senators and the State Department was whether the use of CIA funds to hire Thais to fight on behalf of the Laotian government violates the 1970 Fulbright amendment. This is a provision of the defense appropriation bill signed into law Jan. 11, 1971, after a furious battle between the Senate and the House.

The provision bars the use of defense funds to support "free world forces" in actions "designed to provide military support and assistance to the government of Cambodia or Laos," but specifies that it shouldn't bar the President from taking actions needed "to insure the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia, or to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war."

Symington told the Senate and the reporters, "My personal opinion is that the law has been contravened."

"The amendment said you couldn't spend money to train and put people of foreign governments into Laos or into Cambodia."

Fulbright, too, told reporters later he thinks the law has been violated, and it was his amendment.

Majority Whip Robert P. Griffin (R-Mich.) reportedly defended the ~~financing of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Thai~~ ~~troops~~ ~~and~~ ~~within~~ ~~the~~ ~~Ho~~ ~~Chi~~ ~~Minh~~ ~~trail~~ ~~Bray~~, of ~~the~~ ~~State~~ ~~Department~~ spokesman, acknowledged publicly for the first time that the United States is financing Thai troops to fight in Northern Laos.

Contending these actions were "fully consistent with all pertinent legislation," Bray said that the financing was first authorized by President Kennedy and that "the volunteers are in Laos at the request of the Prime Minister," Souvanna Phouma.

Bray read to reporters a letter from Assistant Secretary of State David Abshire to Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.).

In the context given by Brady, the thrust of the letter (made public Sunday by Kennedy) is that support of the Thai troops in Northern Laos is legal despite the Fulbright amendment, in order to protect U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam, as allowed in the amendment.

Bray also cited an Aug. 20, 1970, statement in the Senate by Fulbright that his amendment doesn't bar "what is going on in Laos, that is, the bombing of the trail, our assistance to Laos or what our people are doing there."

Fulbright told reporters yesterday that at the time he was speaking basically about interdicting the Ho Chi Minh trail in Southern Laos. He said he didn't even know about, and therefore certainly had not been condoning, the B-52 raids in northern Laos, which were started last year, or the financing of Thais to fight in Northern Laos.

Earlier, Fulbright had read to the secret session a statement from William Sullivan, former U.S. Ambassador to Laos, now deputy assistant secretary of state, which Fulbright said indicated Sullivan

saw no real link between the northern Laotian operations and those far to the south on the Ho Chi Minh trail.

Case said, "At the time the Fulbright amendment was passed I was not aware of the Thai mercenaries or the B-52 raids." He added, "Our assent wasn't to these activities but to interdiction of Ho Chi Minh trails."

Jacob K. Javits (I-N.Y.) told reporters the basic question being raised was, "Is this a new war or is it really connected with withdrawal from Vietnam?"

State Department sources said later that the Thais being used aren't recruited on a government-to-government basis, but were individuals recruited from the border-side That population.

LAOS

## U.S. Defends Support of Thai Troops in Laos

By JOHN W. FINNEY

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 7—The State Department said today that the financial and material support that the United States was providing Thai "volunteers" fighting in Laos on behalf of the Laotian Government was "fully consistent with all pertinent legislation."

The department's statement came shortly before the Senate met for three and a half hours in an unusual secret session to review the extent of the American military involvement in the clandestine war in northern Laos.

It was the first formal public acknowledgment that the United States was financing the introduction of Thai troops into the war in Laos. However, a similar, though less formal, acknowledgment had been made on May 21 by a departmental spokesman.

Asked for comment on a statement by Senator J. W. Fulbright that the United States was financing 4,800 Thai troops fighting in Laos, he had refused to comment on the number of troops. But he had said the department had informed Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator Clifford P. Case of New Jersey, a Republican member of the committee, that American support of the Thai troops did not violate the law.

### Violation Issue Debated

Whether the law was being violated was a key question debated in the Senate's secret session today. The legislation in question was an amendment barring the use of mercenaries that had been incorporated into the defense appropriations law

for the current fiscal year at the suggestion of Senator Fulbright.

The State Department, in declaring that the American support of Thai forces in Laos was "fully consistent" with the law, based its case largely on the ground that the program of using "volunteers" in Laos pre-dated enactment of the Fulbright amendment.

One principal point that emerged from the secret session, according to Senators, was an estimate by Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri, that the United States was spending at least \$350-million annually in support of the Laotian Government in the war in northern Laos against the pro-Communist Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese forces. This would be seven times more

than has been publicly acknowledged by the Administration.

At the State Department Charles W. Bray 3d, the department spokesman, declined to give any estimate of the amount of military and economic aid that the United States was providing the Laotian Government or irregular forces in northern Laos.

Mr. Bray said the "volunteers were in Laos at the request" of Premier Souvanna Phouma and "the Administration believes support of this program is fully consistent with all pertinent legislation."

The only public figure that has been given by the Administration is \$52-million in economic aid in the current fiscal year. In addition, Congress reportedly has appropriated some \$100-million in military aid.

LAOS

Approved For Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000300090040-6

THE EVENING STAR

DATE 5 JUN 71 PAGE 1

# Symington Proposes Ceiling On U.S. Aid in North Laos

Associated Press

Sen. Stuart Symington is seeking a \$200 million ceiling on American aid to Laos.

Symington, D-Mo., said security classification prevents him from disclosing the amount being spent on U.S. air operations and support of Thai forces fighting Communist units in Laos.

But the total was reported by other sources to be at least \$250 million a year, and possibly much more.

While the Senate met in secret session yesterday to discuss Laos the State Department confirmed the United States is providing financial and other support to forces in Laos.

Press officer Charles Bray described those troops as volunteers, and said the U.S. support program is consistent with the law.

Symington said they are mercenaries. "My personal opinion is that the law has been contravened."

Sen. J. W. Fulbright, D-Ark., who proposed the amendment forbidding use of U.S. funds to support foreign forces fighting for the governments of Laos and Cambodia, said he thinks that law is being violated.

The amendment excludes ac-

tions that would help promote withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam, or release of American prisoners of war.

The closed session, seventh for the Senate in five years, lasted three hours and 25 minutes, more than twice as long as planned.

"I reported to them, in effect, that what was actually going on in Laos was quite different in some details than we have been told," said Symington, who proposed the secret session.

"We believe that quite a few Thai people, irregulars and regulars, are fighting in Laos. We think that contravenes the law recently passed by Congress.

"We would have known more about it if there had been a ceiling on the money they could have spent, and they would have had to come before us to ask for more authority," Symington said.

He said his amendment would forbid spending more than \$200 million a year in Laos, unless the administration asks specific authority to spend more.

The ceiling would not apply to cost of U.S. air operations in southern Laos, in the area of the Ho Chi Minh trail. But it would cover B52 bombing missions and

other air involvement over the northern part of the country, as well as support of foreign forces.

Fulbright said his staff estimates the cost of U.S. air raids over Laos at over \$500 million a year, not counting the B52 missions only recently disclosed.

Sen. Clifford P. Case, R-N.J., estimated the sum involved in operations away from Communist supply routes in the south to be at least \$250 million a year.

He said that was \$100 million more than he had known about.

The closed Senate session was called to hear Symington report

on findings of two Foreign Relations Committee staff men who visited Laos last April.

That still-classified report, by James G. Lowenstein and Richard Moose, reportedly tells of Central Intelligence Agency financing of about 4,800 Thai troops in Laos.

**VOLUNTEERS, BANGKOK INSISTS****Thais in Laos Identified as 'Regulars'**

By TAMMY ARBUCKIE  
Special to The Star

VIENTIANE, Laos — Despite official statements that the Thai forces serving in Laos are volunteers without official sanction from the Bangkok government, informed sources here say they are regular Thai army troops.

The sources said the troops sent here keep their Thai army rank and salary as well as the salary paid by the Americans.

Some Thai units come here in a group, said the sources, adding that Thailand's 940th Battalion presently is garrisoned on Hill 1663 west of Ban Na on the southwest rim of the Plain of Jars in northern Laos.

The Thais are sent to Laos on temporary detachment for six months or a year, the sources said. There are cases where units are formed from Thais of different units who have volunteered for certain duties in Laos, the sources said. However, these units remain part of the Thai army on loan to the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, the sources said.

The only voluntary aspect of their duty is that Thai soldiers are anxious for assignment to Laos because of the financial benefits.

Officials of the United States and Thailand governments insist the Thai troops in Laos, numbering at least 3,200, are volunteers. Thai officials, in

particular, claim the troops have no official sanction from Bangkok.

(Even the number of troops is in dispute. As a result of U.S. Senate inquiries into the operation, the figure of 4,800 troops presently is given in Washington as the number of Thai troops on duty in Laos.)

The Lao military attributes the official Thai position to corruption. They say only certain members of the Thai government are pocketing payments from the United States, so the entire Thai cabinet may not be informed of the entire U.S. arrangement for Thais to fight in Laos.

Thai troops have been fighting in Laos since late 1964. The first Thai unit in Laos was a battery of 155mm howitzers based near Ban Khay village in the Plain of Jars.

Thai officers and men then were sent separately to guerrilla units run by the CIA.

On Feb. 1, 1967, a reporter met one of these Thais at NAM Bac, Lao fortress 40 miles southwest at Dien Bien Phu. The Thai said he was a captain in the Thai army and came from Bangkok.

An American in civilian clothes was commanding his unit and was responsible for payment, he said.

There were at least 20 Thais with the captain at Nam Bac and Site 217.

On June 25, 1969, the Thai Artillery unit (which remained

in the same place for five years while men were rotated) was overrun when North Vietnamese tanks broke through the neutralist Lao troops.

Following this attack, in which at least 30 Thais were killed, Bangkok insisted on having Thai troops protect the Thai gunners. Thai gunners also were sent to Long Cheng, further south, but this time several hundred — some sources say 800 — Thai infantrymen were sent to protect the artillery.

Part of these units now are at Fire Base Zebra northeast of Long Cheng.

Recently Thai troops have served on the Bolovens Plateau in southern Laos and on operations against Route Seven, the main Hanoi resupply route to its troops in northern Laos.

All troops under American control who need medical help are sent to Thailand directly, American officials say, so Thais have no worries if they are sick or wounded.

The Communist Lao radio claims over 300 Thais have been killed in action in Laos, but American officials say it's less than 200.

The Thai role, according to U.S. officials is to make up for heavy losses among the Meo tribesmen of Gen. Vang Pao, who have been fighting since 1960 against the North Vietnamese, suffering in the last

three years over 8,000 killed in action.

The Lao army claims it's understrength and unable to substantially help Vang Pao because it's spread the length of Laos facing the enemy. This claim, however, is suspect. Hundreds of unemployed young men roam around Vientiane on motorbikes. When Gen. Koupraisith Abhay, the Vientiane military boss, tried to conscript them, he found they are the sons of influential Lao tians who protested conscription and forced Koupraisith to cease his activities.

Also, several thousand Lao troops are not gainfully employed but act as bodyguards, chauffeurs, office personnel or are building new villas for Lao officers.

Despite all this, it may be said that Laos still is woefully short of manpower as well as good field officers and some military discipline. Therefore, Lao need help from its ethnic neighbors the Thais.

The Lao, however, don't want their neighbors in the western provinces of Champassac and Sayaboury, which the Thais covet nor in Mekong River towns where the Thai propensity for the spoils of war may match that of Saigon troops in Cambodia. Therefore, they are in the mountains of northern Laos where the Thais can do the most fighting and the least mischief.

*LAOS*

Approved For Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000300090040-6  
THE NEW YORK TIMES

DATE June 12 71

## Americans Are Barred From Spy Raids in Laos

By WILLIAM BEECHER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 11 — Senator Stuart Symington said the enemy's infiltration activities has gone down recently as the Nixon Administration has decided that Americans will no longer be permitted to enter southern Laos as leaders of teams keeping watch on enemy movements along the Ho Chi Minh Trail network.

Before the South Vietnamese drive into Laos in February and March, Americans had been assigned to such missions. But they were then barred for fear an embarrassing incident might arise that would appear to contradict President Nixon's pledge that no American military men would be involved in ground combat in that Laotian campaign.

Well-placed Nixon Administration sources said that plans to resume the use of Americans on trail-watching teams after the South Vietnamese drive ended had been vetoed by officials at the White House and the Pentagon. The informants said that the decision had been made partly because of growing Congressional criticism of American military activity in Laos and partly because all military missions are being turned over to the South Vietnamese as the United States disengages from the war.

Officials conceded that the

small teams made up of South Vietnamese and of Montagnard tribesmen have taken over the trail-watching missions. But they said there were other means of collecting information, among them aerial reconnaissance and special sensors planted along the trail.

American participation in the missions had come under a secret military unit known officially as the Studies and Observation Group. Established in 1964 as a joint venture of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Army, it has been involved not only in watching trails but also in attempts at rescuing prisoners and other highly sensitive missions in Laos, Cambodia and North Vietnam.

After a closed-door briefing

THE NEW YORK TIMES, SATURDAY, JUNE 12, 1971

## Americans Barred From Laos Spy Raids

Continued From Page 1, Col. 3

of the Senate earlier this week, Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri, declared, "Our activities in Laos have been carried out largely in secret, without Congressional sanction and outside the normal appropriations process."

### Air Strikes a Factor

The main focus of Congressional concern has been American support of Thais and Lao tribesmen who, led by Americans working for the Central Intelligence Agency, have been conducting both combat and surveillance missions against North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao forces in Laos. Extensive American air strikes throughout Laos have also been cited as a source of concern.

When the Studies and Observation Group was established, it was intended primarily for missions in and around North Vietnam.

Some of its teams are known to have slipped into North Vietnamese waters in fast boats to kidnap fishermen, who were brought to South Vietnam for interrogation on conditions in the North and then released. Other teams made up of refugees from North Vietnam were occasionally sent back by helicopter on spy or sabotage missions.

All such operations required advanced approval in Washington, the informants said.

In 1966, the unit was also authorized to watch trails and to spot targets for American bombers. The informants said that these tasks were undertaken by the Army alone, without C.I.A. participation. In late 1966 or early 1967, similar activity reportedly was extended to include Cambodia, again

### A Demilitarized Zone Sought for Angkor Area

PNOMPENH, Cambodia, June 11 (AP)—Cambodia appealed today for a demilitarized zone encompassing the ancient ruins of Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom to protect them from battle damage.

Cambodia's acting Premier Lieut. Gen. Sisowath Sirik Matak, broadcast an appeal for international control of the temples. Angkor Wat was hit in February. Both sides accused the other of firing on the temple, demolishing part of a gatehouse and damaging one of the long walls depicting the history of the ancient Khmer nation.

The Premier said Cambodia would agree to avoid any action that might lead to a military occupation of Angkor and the surrounding temples near the former tourist center of Siem Reap, 143 miles northwest of Phnompenh.

without the participation of C.I.A.

Although the size of the trail-watching teams varied, a typical unit consisted of nine men—three Americans and six Vietnamese or Montagnard tribesmen. At the height of this activity, there were as many as 30 teams assigned to the Laos mission, but usually no more than two or three would be operating at any one time. The missions were said to have lasted from several hours to several days.

Information was sent by radio to a special aircraft flying along the border for relay to Air Force units and intelligence centers in South Vietnam.

According to the informants, the teams operated no more than about 20 to 30 miles inside Laos. Any watching of trails beyond that point, it was said, was assigned to special guerrilla units organized in Laos by the C.I.A.

Pentagon and other sources said that with the start of the South Vietnamese thrust into Laos, the leaders of the Studies and Observation Group were told that the Administration did not want to risk the embarrassment that would result from the capture of soldiers on an intelligence mission in Laos, even though, strictly speaking, they would not have been involved in combat.

### 'Still Has Some Missions'

After the South Vietnamese pulled out of Laos, the group, which has headquarters in Saigon, circulated a memorandum saying that it planned to resume its trail-watching activities. When the memorandum reached Washington, the group was told that the watching of trails would be carried out exclusively by the South Vietnamese.

"While the group's teams are under specific orders not to get involved in fighting," one officer said, "their job is to move in and out undetected. There are times when they have been discovered and have had to exchange fire with the enemy as helicopters came in to take them out."

The Studies and observation Group, it was reported, is not being disbanded at this point. "It still has some missions," an official said.

He added that the group could still be called upon to stage rescue attempts while American prisoners remain in Southeast Asia. He refused to discuss any other missions.

GIVE A KID A CAMP.  
VIA FRESH AIR FUND.

Our world is made up of individuals, and I think that in the individual is where any kind of a change or solution must start. It can't stop there, though, because it must eventually reach the top. For example, if a person is happy he won't mind separating his garbage for recycling, giving away some of his food or money, thinking of the other party before he demands more rights or throws a bomb. If he is happy he will have a concern for other people. If everyone did his individual part in helping to solve such major problems, and took down just one brick that wall would be gone in no time.

That is a lot of if's. How can a person be happy so he will want to do his part? As I've already said, happiness means different things to different people, but a full stomach, a roof over one's head, and a feeling of acceptance and security among one's peers usually helps. For those of us who are lucky enough to have these things already, happiness should be helping others to find them, also. Happiness is contagious, and even if you can't give a person what he needs most, a smile or a hello can sometimes mean just as much. Then maybe he will pass that smile on to another person.

Sometimes I have to stop to think, and assure myself that we, the people of this planet, are not going backwards—or becoming more violent, egotistical, and antagonistic. I always manage to convince myself that we aren't although sometimes it appears that way because it's always the negative and not the positive things that we hear about. The number of people who truly care about other people is growing, and man is beginning to spread his concern over a wider circle of humanity. We usually care about our family and friends and we want them to be happy, but as the years go by there are *more and more* of us who care about the people in our city, state, county, and world as individuals. By caring, I mean wanting each person to be happy and secure and, wanting this bad enough to do something about it. If each inhabitant of this earth cared about the rest of mankind as individuals our brick wall would disappear, and I hope that we can destroy it before it crushes us.

I'd just like to see everyone here *really happy* and able to show it. Sometime—try saying HI to someone you don't know—take off the mask for awhile—really feel the smile you are giving everyone—forget your problems—make someone else happy—and if you can't do that at least you can be happy.

Well, I know what I can do to make everyone happy *now*—that is to end this speech so that we can all get out of this wind. Have a happy day tomorrow! and make it happy for someone else too. The world is only what we make it—so let's make it happy!

#### ANNIVERSARY CONGRATULATIONS TO FATHER WALSH

#### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, congratulations are in order for Father Gerald W. Walsh who celebrated the 25th anniversary of his ordination to the Holy Priesthood on June 1, 1971. Father Walsh returned to St. Mary's Church in Nutley, N.J. where he had spent his early priesthood to perform a special mass with St. Mary's pastor, Msgr. John J. Feeley.

Father Walsh is an ardent contributor to both his parish and his community.

His humane spirit pervades all who know him. Let me offer my warmest thanks for his devoted service and wish him continued personal fulfillment in the future.

(which remained in the same place for five years while men were rotated) was overrun when North Vietnamese tanks broke through the neutralist Lao troops.

Following this attack, in which at least 30 Thais were killed, Bangkok insisted on having Thai troops protect the Thai gunners. Thai gunners also were sent to Long Cheng, further south, but this time several hundred—some sources say 800—Thai infantrymen were sent to protect the artillery.

Part of these units now are at Fire Base Zebra northeast of Long Cheng.

Recently Thai troops have served on the Bolovens Plateau in southern Laos and on operations against Route Seven, the main Hanoi resupply route to its troops, in northern Laos.

All troops under American control who need medical help are sent to Thailand directly, American officials say, so Thais have no worries if they are sick or wounded.

The Communist Lao radio claims over 300 Thais have been killed in action in Laos, but American officials say it's less than 200.

The Thai role, according to U.S. officials is to make up for heavy losses among the Meo tribesmen of Gen. Vang Pao, who have been fighting since 1960 against the North Vietnamese, suffering in the last three years over 8,000 killed in action.

The Lao army claims it's under strength and unable to substantially help Vang Pao because it's spread the length of Laos, facing the enemy. This claim, however, is suspect. Hundreds of unemployed young men roam around Vientiane in motorbikes. When Gen. Kouprasith Abhay, the Vientiane military boss, tried to conscript them, he found they are the sons of influential Lao-tians who protested conscription and forced Kouprasith to cease his activities.

Also, several thousand Lao troops are not gainfully employed but act as bodyguards, chauffeurs, office personnel or are building new villas for Lao officers.

Despite all this, it may be said that Laos still is woefully short of manpower as well as good field officers and some military discipline. Therefore, Lao needs help from its ethnic neighbors, the Thais.

The Lao however, don't want their neighbors in the western provinces of Champasac and Sayaboury, which the Thais covet nor in Mekong River towns where the Thai propensity for the spoils of war may match that of Saigon troops in Cambodia. Therefore, they are in the mountains of northern Laos where the Thais can do the most fighting and the least mischief.

#### HORTON PRAISES MRS. DONALD LOETZER FOR HER AFFIRMATION OF AMERICA

#### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, during these times of protest by our Nation's youth, the very philosophies upon which this country was established are being questioned. At times, anti-American sentiments and acts seem to overshadow positive feelings for this country and our leader's goals.

There is little doubt that we must do what we can to foster respect for and understanding of this country among people of all ages, especially among our youth.

Concerned about the destiny of this country and about the young people who

June 15, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—*Extensions of Remarks*

E 5875

tively with the common problems of modern society as reflected by the soldier of today. I believe the young people of our country are looking for responsibility, challenge, fulfillment, job satisfaction and adventure. I believe they are searching for purpose and direction as well. The Army can satisfy these aspirations.

We are acutely aware that a few of our people have not lived up to the high standards of military leadership. The military is a hard, tough, and demanding profession. So are our standards. We cannot afford . . . nor will we tolerate . . . anything less than the highest personal and professional standards. In this respect, the American people must not be hasty to judge. There are too many capable . . . dedicated . . . and honorable men in the military to allow the acts of a few to degrade their standards and diminish their pride.

Despite the occasional departures from our norms, the Army's performance need not be defended. The Army has done what it was ordered to do . . . and it has done it well . . . in Vietnam and elsewhere. The record is a proud one.

Nowhere has this been better demonstrated than in Vietnam, where the Army has fought a difficult, complex war—taking fire at home as well as on the battlefield. We have done essentially what we were asked to do—prevent a communist takeover in the South. I am proud of the job that the Army has done.

The record of the Army goes beyond Vietnam. Although Vietnam has grabbed the lion's share of headlines, the Army has also performed well in other areas of the world.

Along the DMZ in Korea and on the Czechoslovakian border where one incident could ignite another war.

The Dominican Republic where a communist takeover in a smoldering civil war was thwarted.

The buildup in Florida during the Cuban missile crisis where land power and the capability to project it on a hostile shore aided in cooling the first nuclear confrontation.

And the reinforcement of Berlin with a battle group from West Germany demonstrating to the Soviets that we were serious in our commitment to keep land lines of communication open to that city.

This is the record of an excellent organization of dedicated men who have performed admirably in a difficult role—a role that has been widely misunderstood, frequently misinterpreted, and occasionally misrepresented.

Despite this proud record, the Army by itself cannot rally public support. Yet its vitality is dependent on support, understanding, and encouragement from the American people from whom it springs and who it serves. If the military continues to receive indiscriminate abuse . . . if it is not provided adequate resources . . . and if it is not supported as an essential and respectable profession, we can hardly expect to attract young Americans to serve in the numbers and quality required. And, the consequences for our Nation's security will be ominous indeed.

I urge you, then, to look at us critically but with understanding. The Army regards constructive criticism as a positive contribution to its forward progress. At the same time, its success is contingent in large part on public understanding which is balanced, informed and sympathetic.

At the beginning, I mentioned that the members of your profession and mine were joined in many common purposes and aspirations, essentially pointed toward the well-being and progress of the Nation we love. We in the Army will continue to dedicate ourselves to that end. I would hope, in your role, that you would assist us in obtaining the public understanding and fundamental support which are essential if we are to succeed.

## HAVE A HAPPY DAY

## HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1971

MR. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my personal privilege to participate in a graduation ceremony at Ukiah High School in my First Congressional District of California.

One of the principal speakers of the evening was a lovely and talented young lady, Janet Broaddus, daughter of one of our highly respected judges of the superior court of Mendocino County—Judge Broaddus.

As I listened to the message being delivered to her classmates, the graduates' parents and friends, I kept saying to myself, "This girl is really on target." The speech had real substance and meaning, in addition to its timeliness.

Two very significant points left a lasting impression on me and prompted me to respond following her speech, by suggesting "We have too many people that are against everything—what we need are more people who are for something."

Janet said:

I believe that intelligence and righteousness cannot solve problems without love and happiness and as I look around me I see millions of problems—large and small—with millions of solutions—all intricately worked out. But all the intelligence, power and money in the world are never going to solve anything, if we are all struggling against each other.

Janet's eloquent words and articulate delivery made a profound impression on all who were in attendance. I want to share these words with my colleagues in the Congress and also record them permanently in our official document, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that others throughout the United States might gain the same inspiration from her remarks as we, who were present, did. Janet Broaddus is an outstanding example of this great generation of young people who are about to assume expanding leadership roles as, together, we meet the challenges of change.

The speech follows:

## HAVE A HAPPY DAY

(By Janet Broaddus)

Dr. Coryell, Congressman Clausen, Parents, Ladies and Gentleman, Fellow Graduates, and members of the band: This is a happy time of year. Everyone is out of school, the beautiful weather has finally arrived, and the class of '71 is on its way to new adventures. Since everyone should be happy, I wanted to speak on a topic that is different, refreshing, and happy. I just couldn't sit myself down at my desk in a stuffy room and write a speech about the depressing problems of society, social technology in the seventies, the generation gap, or how the class of '71 plans to save the world. These are all typical topics for a graduation speech, but I wanted to go outside, sit in the warm sun under the bright, blue sky and write about something happy—something that is not depressing. I thought about it and asked myself, "What is happier than happiness?", so I decided to speak tonight about happiness. It is not a typical subject to a speech at graduation, but it seems appropriate.

First of all, what is happiness? Webster describes it as "good luck, prosperity, a state of

well-being". Charles Schultz says that "happiness is a security blanket", "happiness is having a friend", "happiness is a warm puppy", and on and on. A dictionary can describe the word, but there is more to it than that. Charlie Brown and his friends can describe the feeling, because happiness is in everything, everywhere, and it is whatever you want it to be, or whatever you make it to be. To me happiness is a way of showing a freedom and of expressing a love for the world and its people. It is a feeling that can keep me from worrying needlessly. Happiness is a feeling that everyone should be able to experience all the time, and not just when they have a stroke of good luck.

That's what happiness is—so what about it? Well I said I didn't want to speak on problems of society, and I still don't, but they do exist like a brick wall across the path of our future which cannot be ignored. It is depressing to know that there are millions of starving people in our world, to see the poverty and the slums only a couple miles from the White House in Washington, D.C., to see all the prejudice and racial riots, to watch our magnificent wilderness become covered with concrete or polluted with deadly chemicals. It doesn't make anyone happy to know that there is still a war in Viet Nam or to open the morning paper to a headline reading, "The 24th Body Found."

Why am I talking about happiness when all these problems still exist in the world? Because I believe that intelligence and righteousness cannot solve problems without love and happiness. These problems have all existed since man was created and we are still struggling to solve them. The brick wall is not being knocked down. It is slowly being chipped at, but new bricks are being laid faster than they can be destroyed. How much longer will they exist? How much longer can we exist with them? As I look around me I see millions of problems—large and small—with millions of solutions—all intricately worked out. But all the intelligence, power and money in the world are never going to solve anything, if we are all struggling against each other. There is too much bitterness in our world—politicians and voters, parents and children, educators and students are all slowly pulling at each other as if each were a section of a rubber band in the hands of a very nervous person.

Everyone fights for what he believes is right, and everyone wants more rights than he already has. But who really knows what is right? There could be many solutions to one problem and then the purpose usually changes to that of who is able to have his solution accepted—and the battle goes on while the problem remains. The emphasis today, not just in our country but all over the world, is too much on nationalism instead of individualism. If it were possible for governments to consider the happiness of the individuals involved before the pride of the country, the face of a political party, or what is considered to be "right" for the nation, the world, or the people, I think there would be a lot of quick changes. But the way society and government are structured this is not very easy. For example, in order for everyone at the Paris Peace Talks to have all those pressures lifted from their shoulders there would have to be a revolution in the minds of every single person on this earth at exactly the same moment. I'd say that's just a little bit impossible, but then again nothing worthwhile is easy to accomplish.

If we can't start at the top and work down, we can start at the bottom and work up—start with the individual and work up through the larger organizations of humanity. So far I've been talking about big problems and big governments, but the same is true down the line through state governments, local governments, community organizations, families, all the way to the relationship of two people meeting on the street.